



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/346,354	07/02/1999	SAEED GANJI	EFIM0051	2282

31408 7590 02/26/2003

JAMES TROSINO  
One Sansome Street  
Suite 2000 #2003  
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94104

EXAMINER

POON, KING Y

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2624

DATE MAILED: 02/26/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231

SERIAL NUMBER	FILED DATE	ART UNIT	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
09346354			
EXAMINER		ART UNIT	
Poon		2624	
PAGE NUMBER		20	
DATE MAILED:			

Below is a communication from the EXAMINER in charge of this application

COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS

ADVISORY ACTION

☒ THE PERIOD FOR RESPONSE:

- a) ☐ is extended to run \_\_\_\_\_ or continues to run \_\_\_\_\_ from the date of the final rejection
- b) ☒ expires three months from the date of the final rejection or as of the mailing date of this Advisory Action, whichever is later. In no event however, will the statutory period for the response expire later than six months from the date of the final rejection.

Any extension of time must be obtained by filing a petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a), the proposed response and the appropriate fee. The date on which the response, the petition, and the fee have been filed is the date of the response and also the date for the purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. Any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.17 will be calculated from the date of the originally set shortened statutory period for response or as set forth in b) above.

☐ Appellant's Brief is due in accordance with 37 CFR 1.192(a).

☒ Applicant's response to the final rejection, filed 2/3/2003 has been considered with the following effect, but it is not deemed to place the application in condition for allowance:

1. ☐ The proposed amendments to the claim and/or specification will not be entered and the final rejection stands because:
- a. ☐ There is no convincing showing under 37 CFR 1.116(b) why the proposed amendment is necessary and was not earlier presented.
  - b. ☐ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search. (See Note).
  - c. ☐ They raise the issue of new matter. (See Note).
  - d. ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal.
  - e. ☐ They present additional claims without cancelling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE:

2. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claims \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowed if submitted in a separately filed amendment cancelling the non-allowable claims.
3. ☒ Upon the filing an appeal, the proposed amendment ☒ will be entered ☐ will not be entered and the status of the claims will be as follows:

Claims allowed: \_\_\_\_\_  
Claims objected to: \_\_\_\_\_  
Claims rejected: 1-4, 9, 11.

However;

☐ Applicant's response has overcome the following rejection(s): \_\_\_\_\_

4. ☒ The affidavit, exhibit or request for reconsideration has been considered but does not overcome the rejection because see attachment

5. ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will not be considered because applicant has not shown good and sufficient reasons why it was not earlier presented.

☐ The proposed drawing correction ☐ has ☐ has not been approved by the examiner.

☐ Other

*Gabriel Garcia*

GABRIEL GARCIA  
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Art Unit: 2624

**Attachment**

With respect to applicant's argument that deSilva does not teach producing a PPD text file, has been considered.

In reply: Column 13, line 29, deSilva teaches to create a personality document (PPD text file) for each type of a printer.

With respect to applicant's argument that the office action concedes deSilva does not teach generating or revising a PPD text file that includes text translated from a first language to a second language, and there is no motivation to combine the references cited, has been considered.

In reply: deSilva teaches a development environment (see developer, column 12 line 48, column 13 line 29-32) for producing a PostScript (abstract) printer description, (PPD column 18 line 32) text file associated with a printer (column 12, line 36), the development environment comprising: a base PPD text file (column 18 line 30-62; PPD text files, printer personality document, column 12 line 36) comprise information regarding the printer (column 12, lines 35-50), the information including text in a first language (column 18, lines 35-60), the based PPD text file adapted for a first software platform. (computer, column 9, lines 42-50)

deSilva does not teach that the developer uses a PPD generator to import the base PPD and to generate therefrom a second PPD text file that includes text translation from the first language to a second language for a second software platform.

Andrew, in the same area of developing computer programs for computers to execute, (column 1 line 15-25), teaches that not every computer program developed can be executed on

Art Unit: 2624

every machine (column 1 line 30), and that the computer program is typically complex and difficult to write. (Column 1 line 35-36). Rewriting programs in multiple languages to run on multiple brands of computers is impractical. (Column 1 line 36-37) To solve the problem, Andrew teaches that a programmer would write and maintain the computer program in a based source language, (column 1 line 62-63), and to use a translator (fig. 4, column 3 line 35-40) to import the source language and translate the source language to other languages (see target language, column 1 line 64-65; and column 1 line 25-32 teaches that there are multiple target languages for multiple target computers) for other software platforms.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the PPD files developing method of deSilva by having the developer of deSilva to use translators (PPD generator) to import the base PPD and to generate therefrom a second PPD text file that includes text translation from the first language to a second language for a second software platform.

It would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the PPD files developing method of deSilva by the teaching of Andrew because of the following reasons: (a) it would save time and effort for the PPD file developer by avoiding rewriting complex and difficult programs in multiple languages to run on multiple brands of computers.